

REMARKS

Claims 14-22 have been amended. No claims are canceled or added. Claims 1-42 are pending. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed August 23, 2007 is addressed hereinafter.

ISSUES NOT RELATING TO PRIOR ART

Claim 13 stands objected as allegedly lacking antecedent basis (Office Action, Section 1, Page 2). This assertion is respectfully traversed. Claim 13 recites a “computer-readable storage medium”, which is indeed supported within Applicant’s specification, at least within paragraphs [0104], [0105], [0107], or [0111] at various instances therein, as well as other locations. Within at least those paragraphs, as well as numerous others, Applicant thus discloses a computer readable medium that engages in activities related to storing and storage, so that the phrase “computer-readable storage medium” is adequately supported in the specification.

Claims 14-22 stand objected as allegedly failing to refer back to parent claim 13 (Office Action, Section 2, Page 2). These claims have been amended.

ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART

Claims 1-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,825 to Underwood et al (Office Action, Page 3, Sections 3 and 4). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

All of Applicant’s independent claims recite the following elements in various combinations: widgets, business objects, a service object manager, and a controller. These elements, as well as others, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the Underwood reference.

Widgets are described (at least) as representing properties of business objects as HTML (paragraph 0037), automatically generating executable code (paragraph 0037), performing data validation (paragraph 0037), and being arranged into a panel class (paragraph 0042), as well as having numerous other features.

No equivalent for the claimed widget exists within Underwood. The portion of the Office Action at page 3, section 4 cites Underwood's col. 41, lines 14-36 as containing subject matter which anticipates the claimed widget. However, this cited portion instead discusses a Definer, Ordered Tree Classes, and Component Classes. It is unclear how these elements relate to the claimed widget.

Additionally, business objects are described (at least) as defining a user action for an application program (paragraph 0037), being a source of parameters which define user options (paragraph 0037), and having definitions which derive from service objects (paragraph 0060), as well as having numerous other features.

No equivalent for the claimed business objects exists within Underwood. The portion of the Office Action at page 3, section 4 cites Underwood's col. 13, lines 52-61 as containing subject matter which anticipates the claimed business objects. However, this cited portion instead discusses a Site Definer having predefined site definitions. It is unclear how these elements relate to the claimed business objects. Additionally, the business objects are not predefined, but instead derive from service objects 102 which do not come into existence until a developer creates them (paragraph 0060) and thus cannot be "predefined".

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has other deficiencies, including at least a lack of anticipation of the claimed service object manager, and also of the controller. Each of the other independent claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 23, and 33 recite at least some of the features described above.

Accordingly, the rejections of these claims are deficient, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Each of the dependent claims depends, directly or indirectly, on one of claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 23, and 33, and therefore incorporates by dependency each of the features described above that distinguishes the base independent claim from Underwood. Therefore, each of the dependent claims is allowable over Underwood for the same reasons given above for claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 23, and 33. Further, the dependent claims recite features that independently render them patentable.

CONCLUSIONS & MISCELLANEOUS

For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone relating to any issue that would advance examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: November 16, 2007

/ChristopherMTanner#41518/

Christopher M. Tanner

Reg. No. 41,518

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1093
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1238
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076